

1 THOMAS A. NITTI, SBN 77590  
tnitti@prodigy.net  
2 LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS A. NITTI  
1250 Sixth Street, Suite 205  
3 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
Phone: (310) 393-1524 Fax (310) 576-3581

4 Attorneys for Defendant Rehabilitation Associates, LLC  
5  
6  
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 OXFORD STREET PROPERTIES, LLC,  
11 etc.,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 LANCE ROBBINS, etc. et al.

15 Defendants.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

Case No.: CV10-02999 VBF (RZx)

**DISCOVERY MATTER**

**REPLY OF DEFENDANT  
REHABILITATION ASSOCIATES,  
LLC IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO  
STAY ALL PENDING DISCOVERY  
PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA  
SLAPP STATUTE, C.C.P. SECTION  
425.16.**

[Declaration of Thomas A. Nitti Filed  
Concurrently herewith]

Hon. Ralph Zarefsky

Date: February 14, 2010

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Place: Courtroom 540

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28



1           3.       Oxford falsely represents to this Court that Rehab and counsel to  
 2 Rehab, Thomas Nitti, gave "...instructions to third parties to ignore Plaintiff's  
 3 subpoenas..." Opposition, page 5, lines 7-9. Oxford offers no evidence whatever of  
 4 such a claim and neither Rehab nor Mr. Nitti ever instructed anyone to ignore the  
 5 subpoenas. See, Declaration of Thomas A. Nitti filed concurrently herewith. Rehab  
 6 and Nitti have done nothing wrong; as documented below, a joint stipulation is not  
 7 required herein and sanctions are completely unwarranted.  
 8  
 9

10           4.       It is respectfully submitted that though Oxford attempts to argue the  
 11 merits of the Special Motion to Strike (Opposition, page 3, fn. 1; page 4, fn. 3), such  
 12 arguments are properly before the Honorable Valerie Baker Fairbank for decision by  
 13 her on February 17, 2011, and are not properly raised by Oxford on this Motion to  
 14 Stay.  
 15

16           In furtherance of the above, Rehab additionally states as follows:  
 17

18           **II.       A JOINT STIPULATION IS NOT REQUIRED UNDER LOCAL**  
 19 **RULE 37 SINCE THE RULE DOES NOT BY ITS TERMS APPLY AND DUE**  
 20 **TO THE IMMEDIATE NEED TO FILE THE MOTION TO STAY**  
 21

22           Local Rule 37 applies by its terms to "any motion relating to discovery  
 23 pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 26-37." The present Motion for Stay is being brought  
 24 pursuant to the California SLAPP Statute, C.C.P. Section 425.16, and not under the  
 25 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.  
 26

27           Further, the parties met and conferred in this matter on January 4, 10, and 11,  
 28 2011. The motion was then filed on January 12, 2011, the same day Weiss

Accountancy was to produce. The preparation of a joint stipulation would have mooted the Motion to Stay by delaying the filing thereof to a time after production was made, to the prejudice of Rehab and the other defendants. Thus, the motion had to be filed without a joint stipulation (assuming it normally would be required) to protect the rights of defendants and to preserve the issue for the Court's consideration.

In addition, Oxford is applying one standard to itself and a different standard to Rehab in claiming a joint stipulation is required under Local Rule 37. On January 13, 2011, Oxford filed "Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application For (1) Clarification That Discovery Is Not Stayed; (2) A Protective Order; and (3) The Setting of an Order to Show Cause Re: Sanctions against Rehabilitation Associates, LLC" (dkt. 239). This application was filed without any meeting of counsel and without a joint stipulation. Oxford is in no position to insist that a joint stipulation be filed by Rehab, especially in view of the necessity of an immediate filing of the Motion to Stay.

**III. THE SLAPP LAW AT ISSUE PROVIDES FOR AN AUTOMATIC STAY OR, AT A MINIMUM, A STAY PENDING A SHOWING BY OXFORD THAT DISCOVERY IS NEEDED TO OPPOSE THE SLAPP MOTION.**

Code of Civil Procedure section 425.16, subdiv. (g) provides that the filing of a SLAPP motion automatically stays all further discovery (without Court order) until the court rules on the motion in state court.

The SLAPP statute, as applied in Federal Court, provides for (1) an

1 automatic stay or (2) a stay pending an affidavit or declaration made by the non-  
 2 movant depending upon whether the movant is attacking the plaintiff's pleading, or  
 3 the plaintiff's proof. The case of *Rogers v. Home Shopping Network*, 57 F. Supp. 2d  
 4 973 (C.D. Cal. 1999) states the rule as follows:

6 "In sum, §425.16 applies in federal court. However, it cannot be used in a  
 7 manner that conflicts with the Federal Rules. This results in the following  
 8 outcome: If a defendant makes a special motion to strike based on alleged  
 9 deficiencies in the plaintiff's complaint, the motion must be treated in the  
 10 same manner as a motion under Rule 12(b)(6) except that the attorney's fee  
 11 provision of §425.16(c) applies. If a defendant makes a special motion to  
 12 strike based on the plaintiff's alleged failure of proof, the motion must be  
 13 treated in the same manner as a motion under Rule 56 except that again the  
 14 attorney's fees provision of § 425.16(c) applies." *Id.* at p. 983.

17  
 18 The instant motion is an attack on Oxford's pleadings, akin to a 12(b)(6)  
 19 motion and the stay provision thus automatically applies. Code of Civil Procedure  
 20 section 425.16, subdiv. (g)

21  
 22 *Metabolife Int'l v. Wornick*, 264 F.3d 832, 845, 850 (9th Cir. 2001), relied  
 23 upon by Oxford in its Opposition, only cites the second type of SLAPP motion under  
 24 *Rogers* (a movant's attack on proof, not the pleadings) and is therefore not  
 25 controlling herein.

26  
 27 However, even assuming *Metabolife* and Rule 56(d) apply in this matter,  
 28 even under *Metabolife*, a plaintiff such as Oxford must still show by "affidavit or

1 declaration” that it needs further probative information solely available from the  
 2 defendants that is essential to oppose the SLAPP motion. See, *Metabolife Int’l v.*  
 3 *Wornick, supra*, 264 F.3d 832, 845, 850. No affidavit or declaration has ever been  
 4 filed under Rule 56. (See below.)  
 5

6  
 7 **IV. OXFORD’S ARGUMENT THAT IT HAS MADE A PROPER**  
 8 **SHOWING TO PERMIT DISCOVERY IS WITHOUT MERIT.**  
 9

10 Oxford attempts to argue in the alternative that it has made a proper showing  
 11 to permit discovery by incorporating by reference prior documents previously  
 12 submitted to the Court in this matter. Opposition, page 4, lines 16-21. Such argument  
 13 is completely meritless.  
 14

15 Under the law, Oxford is entitled at most to specific discovery from the  
 16 defendant that is essential to oppose the SLAPP Motion after Oxford makes a  
 17 showing by affidavit or declaration. At no time has Oxford ever argued that it  
 18 needed specific discovery essential to oppose any SLAPP motion; nor has any  
 19 affidavit or declaration ever been filed under Rule 56. *Metabolife Int’l v. Wornick,*  
 20 *supra*, 264 F.3d 832, 845, 850. Further, at no time has this Court or has Judge  
 21 Fairbank ever been asked to rule on such an issue by Oxford. See, Declaration of  
 22 Thomas A. Nitti filed concurrently herewith.  
 23

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

1                   **V.     SANCTIONS ARE COMPLETELY UNWARRANTED AND NO**  
2                   **PROPER SHOWING HAS BEEN MADE IN ANY EVENT.**  
3

4           The sanctions Oxford seeks under Local Rule 37-4 are unwarranted. The rule  
5 provides:

6           “The failure of any counsel to comply with or cooperate in the foregoing  
7           procedures may result in the imposition of sanctions.”  
8

9  
10          Federal Rule of Civil Procedure section 37(a)(5)(B) authorizes sanctions in the  
11 form of “reasonable expenses incurred in opposing the motion, including attorney's  
12 fees,” but further provides:

13          “But the court must not order this payment if the motion was substantially  
14          justified or other circumstances make an award of expenses unjust.”  
15

16  
17          The Motion is substantially justified to protect the rights of defendants under  
18 the SLAPP statute and Mr. Nitti never instructed third parties to ignore any subpoena.  
19 Moreover, Local Rule 37 does not require a joint stipulation under these facts and  
20 there was no time to prepare a joint statement in any event.  
21

22          Moreover, Oxford makes no showing of attorney-hours expended; no showing  
23 of an hourly rate charged; and no showing of reasonable attorney’s fees it has  
24 incurred. Thus, Oxford has made no showing to award sanctions.  
25

26 //

27 //

28 //

**VI. CONCLUSION.**

Based on the above, the Opposition is meritless and the Motion to Stay should be granted.

DATED: January 31, 2011

LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS A. NITTI

By /s/ Thomas A. Nitti  
THOMAS A. NITTI  
Attorneys for Rehabilitation Associates,  
LLC



**PROOF OF SERVICE**

State of California, County of Los Angeles

I, NYDIA ESCALONA, declare and say:

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18, and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 1250 Sixth Street, Suite 205, Santa Monica CA 90401.

On January 31, 2011, I served the following document(s) described as:

**REPLY OF DEFENDANT REHABILITATION ASSOCIATES, LLC IN  
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STAY ALL PENDING DISCOVERY PURSUANT  
TO THE CALIFORNIA SLAPP STATUTE, C.C.P. SECTION 425.16.**

**[Declaration of Thomas A. Nitti Filed Concurrently herewith]**

on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed as follows:

PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT A

☒ BY FAX – I faxed the document to the fax number indicated below the addressee's name and address (without envelope) **as to counsel to Oxford only.**

☐ BY E-MAIL – I emailed the document to the e-mail address below the addressee's name and address (without envelope).

☒ BY MAIL – I deposited such envelope in the mail at Santa Monica, California. The envelope was mailed with the postage thereon fully prepaid **as to all other counsel.**

☒ FEDERAL – I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Date: January 31, 2011

/s/ Nydia Escalona  
NYDIA ESCALONA

**ATTACHMENT A**

**RUSS, AUGUST AND KABAT**

Matthew A. Rips, Esq.  
mrips@raklaw.com  
Nathan Meyer, Esq.  
nmeyer@raklaw.com  
12424 Wilshire Boulevard  
Twelfth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
Fax: (310) 826-6991

**LAW OFFICES OF JOHN C. WILSON**

John C. Wilson, Esq.  
Jcwilson001@aol.com  
2108 Navy St.,  
Santa Monica, CA 90401

**LAW OFFICES OF CYRUS ANVARIPOUR**

Cyrus Anvaripour, Esq.  
anvaripour23@aol.com  
5240 Zelzah Ave  
Encino, CA 91316

**LAW OFFICES OF SARA NAHEEDY**

Sara Naheedy, Esq.  
snaheedy@gmail.com  
49 Goleta Point Dr.  
Corona Del Mar, CA 92625

**LAW OFFICES OF MARY E. MASI**

Mary E. Masi, Esq.  
attymasi@msn.com  
2211 Corinth Ave, Suite 309  
Los Angeles, CA 90064

**STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP**

Julia B. Strickland, Esq.  
Scott M. Pearson, Esq.  
Samuel B. Lutz, Esq.  
2029 Century Park East, 16th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90067